



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/298,603

04/23/1999

BORIS KLOTS

50277210

2232

29989

7590

05/05/2003

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP  
1600 WILLOW STREET  
SAN JOSE, CA 95125

EXAMINER

VU, THONG H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2142

DATE MAILED: 05/05/2003

16

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/298,603

Applicant(s)

KLOTS ET AL.

Examiner

Thong H Vu

Art Unit

2142

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 23 April 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: attachement.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: NONE.Claim(s) objected to: NONE.Claim(s) rejected: 1-4,6-9,16-23,25-28 and 30-32.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 23 April 2003 is a) ☒ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_



***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4,6-9,16-23,25-28 and 30-32 have been considered but they are not persuasive to overcome the prior art.

A. Zuili reference:

1.Applicant argues the prior art did not teach mapping data perform by every nodes.

Examiner notes the prior art taught the first node (client) sends request to verification server which compared (mapped) to the stored database [Zuili col 3 lines 53-63]. It is clearly the destination node [device B 16, Zuili Fig 1] received the mapping data, processed and responded to the requestor [device A 14, Zuili Fig 1]. Zuili taught the verifying server may be mainframe, server or local computer [Zuili col 4 line 56-col 5 line 2]. Thus, every nodes performed mapping data or compare requests to its database.

2.As per claims 30-32, applicant argues the prior art does not teach the first work is performed on the second node and the third node.

Examiner notes the prior art taught the verifying server may be mainframe, server or local computer [Zuili col 4 line 56-col 5 line 2]. Thus, every nodes performed mapping data or compare requests to database. It is clearly that the request has been performed at the second node [verifying server 12, Fig 1] and the third node [device B 16, Fig 1].

B. Chessell reference:


1.Applicant argues the prior art did not teach mapping data performed by every nodes.

Examiner notes the prior art taught each server object involved in the transaction can be told to commit the changes (or mapping data) made locally to the local database associated with server object [Chessell col 3 lines 34-50]. It is clearly that each server performed mapping data or commit the data changes to the local database.

2.As per claims 30-32, applicant argues the prior art does not teach the first work is performed on the second node and the third node.

Examiner notes the prior art taught each server object involved in the transaction can be told to commit the changes (or mapping data) made locally to the local database associated with server object [col 3 lines 34-50]. It is clearly that first work or commit the changes is performed by each server (second and third nodes) .

Therefore the rejection is sustained.

  
MARK R. POWELL  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
GROUP 2400